

Serial No.: 10/764,372  
Atty. Docket No.: D5282

### **REMARKS**

In a non-final Action mailed 17 December 2004 the Examiner withdrew from examination, pursuant to applicants' election, claims 1-7 and 13-17. Claims 8-12 were examined and rejected under 35 USC Sec. 102. The only reference currently at issue is Belik et al. (US-Pat. 4,469,369). This substitute amendment adds text relating to the withdrawn claims.

Claim 8 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. The rejection of the claims as anticipated by the Belik '369 reference is respectfully traversed. Claims 8-12 remain active.

The invention relates to construction of a bus body on a chassis. Bus bodies are deconstructed into repeating units (repeating from vehicle to vehicle and sometimes on a given vehicle) for placement on a unitary chassis.

The Belik '369 reference represents a substantially differing approach than that of the invention. Belik provides for unification of body sections with chassis elements. See col. 7, lines 39 and following where it is stated that "Unification of chassis elements alongside with unification of body units . . . allows the number of spare parts to be reduced . . .". Belik seems to criticize the concept of building a body on a chassis. See col. 1, lines 37-46. "[S]oviet industry puts on the market a series of motor buses . . . based on chassis units of trucks." "Bodies of these motor buses are unified practically only in terms of used (starting) materials and some assemblies of interior equipment." And following at col. 2, lines 29-34. "[T]he wide range of chassis restrains the increase in the capacity of the manufacture of buses . . .".

Accordingly Belik not only does not teach selecting body module sections for positioning on a chassis, but suggests that building buses using a chassis (as

Serial No.: 10/764,372  
Atty. Docket No.: D5282


commonly understood and as described in the specification for the application presently at issue) constrains manufacturing capacity, leads to a multiplication of spare parts and adds to the cost of manufacture.

The steps of a method of claim 8 call for providing a chassis for which body sections (of standard types) are selected to fit a predetermined length of the chassis. The body sections are then assembled on the chassis contrary to the teaching of Belik. In addition, while Belik teaches a unified module including a regular passenger door, he does not teach providing "a side auxiliary exit type" body section. The reference fails to anticipate the claim 8.

The remaining dependent claims recite still further elements distinguishing the invention over the prior art. Applicant believes the Claims as amended, or newly submitted, are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable action by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 24, 2005  
Warrenville, IL 60555  
Tel. No. 630/753-3023

  
Jeffrey P. Calfe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 37,105

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR §1.8**

I hereby certify that this **SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR 1.111 IN RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT** is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on or before 24 March 2005 to (703) 872-9306.

Date: 24 March 2005

  
Gathi Majewski

Jeffrey P. Calfe